

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

EDDY CHINCHILLA,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

BELLAGIO, LLC,

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:13-cv-01000-GMN-NJK

ORDER STAYING DISCOVERY
(Docket No. 14)

Pending before the Court is the parties' joint request to stay discovery pending resolution of Defendants' motion to dismiss. *See* Docket No. 14; *see also* Docket No. 4 ("motion to dismiss"). For good cause shown and for the reasons discussed below, the Court hereby **GRANTS** the stipulation to stay discovery pending resolution of the motion to dismiss.

"The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending." *Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 601 (D. Nev. 2011). The case law in this District makes clear that requests to stay all discovery may be granted when: (1) the pending motion is potentially dispositive; (2) the potentially dispositive motion can be decided without additional discovery; and (3) the Court has taken a "preliminary peek" at the merits of the potentially dispositive motion and is convinced that the plaintiff will be unable to state a claim for relief. *Id.* at 602-603.

The Court finds these factors are present here. First, the motion to dismiss is potentially case-dispositive. Second, the motion to dismiss can be decided without additional discovery. Third, the Court has taken a preliminary peek at the merits of the motion to dismiss and believes Plaintiff

1 will be unable to state a claim for relief.¹

2 Accordingly, the stipulation to stay all discovery is hereby **GRANTED**. In the event that the
3 motion to dismiss is not granted in full, the parties shall submit a joint status report to the
4 undersigned within 14 days of the issuance of the order resolving the motion to dismiss. That status
5 report shall indicate what discovery needs to be completed and shall provide a proposed plan for
6 completing it.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: September 10, 2013

9
10 
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ Conducting this preliminary peek puts the undersigned in an awkward position because the
27 assigned district judge who will decide the motion to dismiss may have a different view of its merits.
28 *See Tradebay*, 278 F.R.D. at 603. The undersigned's "preliminary peek" at the merits of that motion is
not intended to prejudice its outcome. *See id.*